

May 12, 1975

institution, a concept of a smaller institution is philosophically so important that we do want the Legislature to stick to this concept but in this particular amendment, there has been some adjustments made to the original Cavanaugh amendment which I feel give, and I emphasize again, give the Department of Corrections everything that they were originally asking for in LB 417. So I urge your adoption of this amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Swigart.

SENATOR SWIGART: Mr. President and members, I oppose the latest amendment as described by Senator Luedtke. I am kind of surprised that this amendment come forth because for several years they worked on this plan, which called, first, for the building of one institution in the city of Lincoln, and now there has been a basic change in the proposal without going back to Committee hearing and I think we are going to get tangled up in the business of trying to locate a place in Omaha. For example, if they start trying to put it out at 30th and Ford, there will be a revolution, I am afraid, and as well as many other places in the city and now we have a place out here where they could build one institution and have it take the place of the one that is there. Incidentally, I have been out and seen the Reformatory and I think it is a fire trap. I think it is on borrowed time. It ought to be changed but I think one of the main reasons that I expect to come in with an amendment following this. I expect to come in with an amendment going back to the original plans but having the provision that we would...it would be a 300 bed maximum because with that and with the work-release program in Omaha where we can rent a structure and put men to work, that that will take the place entirely of the Reformatory and I think that is important because what are we going to end up with if we go along with this new proposal of Luedtke's and Cavanaugh's. We are going to end up with 3 buildings because we are not building anything big enough to take the place of the Reformatory. So I urge you to vote down this amendment because there has been no hearing, because it isn't adequate to take the place of the Reformatory, because it is going to cost a lot more money to run the show. I think we are making a mistake in doing this. I know Senator Luedtke was vehemently for the original and I think we ought to go back to that. I plan to have an amendment, in a few minutes, ready for it. I thought it was ready but I called Mr. Cutshall's office and found that they were working on last minute wording. So they will be in in a few minutes. I propose that you vote down this amendment and be prepared to go back to the other one which we know the Governor approves. He would not veto and it would take the place of that Reformatory and we could get underway for sure this year. We certainly are not sure of the other route. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd like to rise to endorse Senator Luedtke's amendment. I think it is a refinement and improvement over the amendment that Senator Cavanaugh proposed. I think that Senator Swigart put out a good deal of misinformation in his talk that I would